DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 151 870 CS 502 004

AUTHOR Deethardt, John F.
TITLE An Interpretation of National Data on Secondary Speech Communication Curricula.
PUB DATE 77
NOTE 37p.; Report prepared at Texas Tech University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Curriculum Development; *Curriculum Evaluation; *Curriculum Research; *National Surveys; Secondary Education; *Speech Communication; *Speech Curriculum
IDENTIFIERS National Center for Education Statistics

ABSTRACT

This document reports and interprets the survey data produced by the National Center for Education Statistics regarding course offerings and enrollments in secondary speech communication courses in 1961 and 1973. The purpose of assessing this data was to help identify the states with model programs, identify the values shown in standard-setting programs, and inform college-level speech communication curriculum planners of what their counterparts at the high school level are teaching. Using the survey data, the 50 states are ranked according to tradition, scope, availability, and popularity of course offerings. Survey results indicate that the status of the speech communication field appears to be improving in the secondary school, but that the "back-to-basics" movement and the conservative, occupational focus on college campuses appear to be unfriendly forces. The document concludes that teachers, school district policy makers, and state and regional associations need to improve the status of course offerings in each state so that significant interaction at the intrapersonal, interpersonal, group, or public level will not be lost. Detailed tables of state rankings are included. (CC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED151870

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

AN INTERPRETATION OF NATIONAL DATA ON SECONDARY SPEECH COMMUNICATION CURRICULA

by John F. Deethardt

Educators in speech communication continually lament the lack of data on secondary curricula. Sharon Ratliffe, at an academic summer conference in 1973 opined, "...the literature in our field does not appear to include reports of current, comprehensive studies...of what speech communication is actually taught in the public and private secondary schools of our fifty states."[1] With the lack of data, persons interested in better articulation between secondary and tertiary programs shoot from the hip and in the dark like James Gibson at the same conference: "We at the college level have not worked enough or with the appropriate counterparts at the high school level to develop and have implemented effective programs in speech communication. I would argue, vigorously, that the data collected in Missouri is not significantly different from current data available from other states in this section of the country or from national figures. The relationship is bad because there has not been sufficient pressure for a viable program at the high school level."[2] Contrary to Gibson's feelings, the states are significantly different from each other in the tradition, scope, availability and popularity of course offerings in speech communication.

Status reports come in various types. The conferees in the meeting referred to above heard several of one type, the report of one teacher's program in an exemplary school. State reports are numerous.[3] Occasionally a dissertation is written on a regional analysis of programs.[4] Data are voluminous and tables abound. Status studies are difficult to report and the tabular problems become bothersome to editors. In spite of that, the need is great. The data which present problems of organization and interpretation give rise to the positing of criteria for curricular assessment, "value statements about

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John F. Deethardt

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

CS502004

what education should be."[5] An assessment of secondary curricula from a national point of view would identify model states, have implications for college curricula, indicate responsiblities for curricular development falling to state and regional associations, provide a firmer base on which the state can seize control of curricular development and help individual teachers in a comparative speech education by identifying for them the values evidenced in standard-setting programs. In short, the uses of such data analysis are unforseeable; generally, people probably feel the need to enlarge their perspective on what can be done.

NATIONAL DATA

For several decades, the Office of Education has issued data on course offerings in the secondary schools. The information could be used to establish bench marks of development and be put to some uses mentioned above.

It is clear that the field of speech communication is improving its standing in the secondary school curriculum, according to the recent survey made in 1972-73 by the National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES).[6] The report says, "Courses in speech, drama, and debate have mushroomed since the 1960-61 study, with a corresponding increase in the number of specialized offerings in those fields."[7] Studies have been attempted about every decade. The survey of 1961[8] provided data on only five areas: Speech and Public Speaking; Speech Grades 7-8; Theatre; Debate; and Radio, Television. The survey of 1972-73 gathered data on ten areas: Argumentation and Debate (A&D); Communication Theory/Speech Diction (CT/SD); Speech and Public Speaking I (S&PSI); Speech and Public Speaking II (S&PSII); Speech Through Mass Media (STMM); TV/Radio/Film (TV/R/F); Theatre/Drama (T/D); Acting (A); Dramatic Literature/Shakespeare (DL/S); and Play Producation/Creative Dramatics (PP/CD). The latest study notes the trend toward multi-graded courses in all of the major

disciplines, and speech communication in particular: "Speech and public speaking, traditionally an 11th grade course, is now offered in grades 10-12 in 19.2 percent."[9] In addition, over a thousand schools offered speech and public speaking as an ungraded course. Overall, the increase in status of the speech communication field is evidenced by the conclusion that Speech and Public Speaking I is listed among the "handful of courses... offered by 50 percent or more of the schools."[10]

Although they still receive considerable emphasis, the traditional academic courses have been considerably eroded in prominence. The report notes that increased offerings in speech and public speaking are an exception to that trend. "In 1960-61, 35.0 percent of public secondary schools offered this course; in 1972-73, the proportion had risen to 50.0 percent."[11] The authors of the report perceive that the schools are giving considerable emphasis to the communicative skills as well as quantitative skills, American society, and the natural sciences.

A word of caution is required at the outset. The sample (11,388 schools) of the universe (22,833 schools) in the 1961 study was larger than the response in 1972-73 (7,850/22,737); that is, 49.87 percent of the schools were in the sample in 1961, and only 34.52 percent in 1973. Sampling error may have been responsible for such a drastic difference as can be found in the 1973 data for Texas, a very unusual case of loss of status. That state reported argumentation and debate courses in 1961 in 16 schools but in no schools in 1973; in no other state has a course disappeared which had established a foothold. There may have been errors in data processing, typographical processing, or data reporting by a state officer who does not understand the structure of the field of speech communication. The Speech Association of America (now SCA) was one of the advisors contributing to the Handbook, Standard Terminology for

Curriculum and Instruction in Local and State School Systems which was used by the NCES as a classification system for the survey in 1961 and, presumably, in 1973. The increase in classification terminology, while marking a kind of progress in identity, may have added to the burden of the school reporting. For example, Texas ranked sixteenth in the argumentation and debate category in 1961, but slipped to forty-second in 1973, causing its classification and overall ranking to be extremely low. Perhaps the questioned subject matter was not identified properly in data processing due to changes in course names.

PROCEDURES

In spite of such possible sources of error, as exemplified in the case of Texas, it is possible to examine the data of the 1961 and 1973 reports and, on the basis of certain criteria, make judgments about the qualities of programs among the states. It is, therefore, posited that the states can be ranked according to tradition, scope, availability, and popularity of course offerings. Tradition is operationally defined in this interpretation as a reported course offering in both the 1961 and 1973 surveys. Scope is the breadth of types of communication activity that have identity in the different courses being offered; the breadth increased from five to ten over the twelve years between surveys. Availability is the number of schools within a state, which provides the opportunity to enroll in the course. Popularity is a percentage of the total secondary students in the state enrolled in a course. (The popularity ranking was assessed only in the Speech and Public Speaking course, the most widely offered course.) The percentage of schools was calculated by dividing the number of schools in a state reporting offering a course by the total number of schools in that state. A few examples will explain. Idaho had the highest percentage of schools offering Speech and Public Speaking I.

126 of a possible 180 schools reported offering the course in that state. For Theatre, Vermont ranked first with 31 of 57 schools offering the course. Alaska ranked first in the percentage of pupils taking Speech and Public Speaking I (popularity) with 3443 students enrolled out of a possible state student population of 26,872.

The figures for Speech and Public Speaking II, Speech Through Mass Media, Acting, Dramatic Literature, and Play Production/Creative Dramatics were so small that they were not used in the rankings.

The states were rank ordered in each type of speech activity for both 1973 and 1961 surveys. Rankings were added across all course types and divided by the number of types to obtain an overall ranking. The raw data, percentages and rankings in complete tabular form are too lengthy and complicated to appear here but are available from the Educational Resources Information Center.

RESULTS

The fifty states fall into nine categories. The first group contains all the states reporting courses in all categories (meeting the scope criterion) in both 1961 (five categories) and 1973 (ten categories) surveys (meeting the tradition criterion), ranked according to percentage of schools (the availability) and the percentage of pupils in Speech and Public Speaking I (popularity criterion). The top-ranked state is Michigan, followed, in order, by Washington, Colorado, California, Missouri, Ohio, Minnesota, Iowa, New Jersey, Illinois, Wisconsin, New York, and Pennsylvania.

The second group of states lacked course availability, scope, and tradition in one area (one type of course had been added since 1961): Oregon (TV/R/F), Arizona (A&D), Idaho (TV/R/F), Montana (TV/R/F), Indiana (A&D), Wyoming (TV/R/F), South Dakota (TV/R/F), Massachusetts (TV/R/F), Nebraska (T/R/F), and Maryland (TV/R/F).

The third group of states lacked course availability, scope and tradition in two areas (two types of courses, TV/R/F and A&D, added since 1961): Hawaii, Alaska, Nevada, Rhode Island, Delaware, New Mexico, Connecticut, New Hampshire, Louisiana, Virginia, North Carolina, Alabama, Tennessee, and Georgia.

The fourth classification contains one state, Maine, which added three areas since 1961, Theatre, TV/R/F, and Argumentation and Debate.

Two states in the fifth category lacked one type of course in 1973, TV/R/F: Kansas and Oklahoma.

States in the sixth category lacked one type of course both in 1961 and 1973, and another in 1961: Utah (Comminication Theory/Speech/Diction in 1973 and TV/R/F in 1961), Kansas (CT/S/D in 1973 and TV/R/F in 1961), and Vermont (A&D in 1973, TV/R/F in 1961).

The seventh classification has states lacking one type of course (CT/S/D) in 1973 and two types in 1961 (TV/R/F and A&D): Virginia and Mississippi.

States in the eighth classification do not offer courses of two types in the latest survey: Texas (CT/S/D and A&D), Kentucky (TV/R/F and A&D), North Dakota (CT/S/D and TV/R/F), and District of Columbia (A&D and CT/S/D and in 1961, TV/R/F).

The last two states in category nine are lacking three types of availability in the latest report (TV/R/F, A&D, and CT/S/D): Arkansas and South Carolina.

[Insert Tables about here]

INTERPRETATION

If the status of the field of speech communication appears to be improving in the secondary school, another statistic derived from the 1973 data presents the challenge for further improvement. A total of 764,071 students were

enrolled in Speech and Public Speaking I throughout the United States in 1973, but that is only 7.13 percent of the 10,716,131 secondary school population in schools offering that course. What of the 92.87 percent which was not enrolled? The popularity, scope, tradition, and availability of courses is in the care of the state and regional professional associations. This interpretation of the data is offered for the information especially of those lower-ranked states in which there is probably less course activity. What can be done to enhance the popularity of courses in lower-ranked states? What can increase the scope in types of courses in the lower-ranked states? What influences are retarding the availability of even the most basic course in more schools in each state? The trend toward a multi-graded course in speech and public speaking will undoubtedly begin to produce advanced students with which college departments will have to deal. The growing trend toward nongraded courses in speech communication areas bringing together students of different maturational levels may cause problems for the teacher, who will need to be grounded in a developmental understanding of students' values, attitudes, and skills in a growing variety of communication situations.

In a "back-to-basics" climate in the public schools and a new, general conservatism and occupational focus on the college campus, scary inferences are being made about programs in speech communication. The climate appears to be unfriendly to the status of speech communication and all the forces which helped to improve its standing in the schools. Courses have proliferated to meet the demands of previously disadvantaged youth (remedial courses, or specialized ethnic courses,) and of students with accelerated records of achievement. Another force was the relaxation of graduation requirements, occasioning the development of elective courses, alternatives to required courses. The additional courses drew material down from the basic college curriculum.

New instructional methods in science, mathematics and language are responsible for some course proliferation. The consolidation of school populations tended to create larger schools where more variety in course offerings could be tolerated. Special societal problem, one of the earliest being the highway death toll, are being laid at the doorstep of the school. New courses in driver training, consumer eduation, sex education are devised to meet those responsibilities. Overall, 1100 different course titles were reported in 1961. Over 2100 were reported in 1973. The total was reduced by NCES to 291 in 1961, and to 429 academic and 53 occupational titles in 1973. Will the recent conservative climate have the effect of reducing the broad scope of needs that have been coming to the fore?

In a postscript, the NCES report notes that "recent developments in measuring academic achievement...may indicate the need to shift back to the basic skills with renewed emphasis on real-life needs and the ability to get a job after graduation."[13] They refer to the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) findings which show that the young adults in the "real life" situations cannot write and calculate well enough, and to the declining results of the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) over the past years. The report of the special commission appointed by the College Entrance Examination Board to study the decline, which has alarmed many people, cited the so-called distractions of television and political turmoil, along with lowered academic standards, and changes in classroom, a broadening of the kinds of test-takers (women and the poor), and changes in American home life which lower motivation. Willard Wirtz, the Commission chairperson, observed that, in place of the skills measured by the S.A.T., other intellectual behaviors have been developed, such as an increased articulateness and sophistication about the world we live in. If the report impels the educational establishment toward a back-to-basics

policy, then such actions that they take will show no awareness of an alternate interpretation, and the mission of the schools may be made to rest on a misunderstanding of important trends toward the maturation of human relations. The school is not solely to blame for a declining performance of youth in the social and logical codes (language and mathematics) by which we live. The home and family as well as the political climate must also be pointed to. The Scholastic Aptitude Tests are those requiring the skills of reading and writing about language and mathematics to identify that portion of the population which will more easily acquire the benefits of higher education. The high school courses which are directly applicable to the tests are English language arts and mathematics. The NCES survey shows that grade 9 English and elementary algebra slipped 14.8 and 14.9 percentage points between 1961 and 1973 in the percentage of schools providing those courses. Similarly, grade 12 English slipped 29.9 percentage points and plane geometry 26.0 points. On the other hand, speech and public speaking gained 15 percentage points. It appears that the schools are no longer teaching as directly to the test as they, in effect, once were. Those issuing the S.A.T. report warned, "If the only point of a high school education were to produce people with high S.A.T. scores, the answer would be easy---reorganize all teaching to coach for the test."[14] A back-to-basics movement would have to aim at teaching toward the test, and institute neglect of such expressive skills as articulateness which are not assessed by the S.A.T. procedures.

The increased verbal interaction of television comedy, drama, variety and contest shows has impressed a non-paper-and-pencil process on the attitudes, motivations, and interests of youth. In their minds, they may have begun to set down functional literacy alongside functional articulateness as socially and occupationally desireable achievements, and the schools have begun to

to accede to their requirements. School boards, the elders, may be able to reduce the availability and scope of courses in speech communication at the secondary level in setting a more reactionary than progressive course for the educational system, but the students and especially the teachers can capitalize on the tradition and popularity of speech courses. The tradition is prepotent in meeting growing needs, and popularity could create important counter-pressures. Speech communication teachers can only survive if they individually and their numbers in concert provide quality teaching and curricula. Literacy has been asked to move over and make room for oracy, for the dialogue of daily interaction as distinct from the monologue of the printed word.

The need of the younger will not be readily apprehended and responded to by the older generation. Television has had some influence on the paper-and-pencil world of S.A.T. In reality, the culture of the television generation has different requirements. Communication across cultures from the elder to the younger generation requires an appreciation of a basic difference. Walter Ong, a philosopher of language, states the distinction very well. "In general, before the invention of script man is more oral-aural than afterward, not merely in that his words are all spoken and heard words, never visually perceived marks on a surface, but in that his whole response to actuality is thereby organized differently from that of typographic man. Writing, and most particularly the alphabet, shifts the balance away from the aural to the visual, favoring a new kind of personality structure, and alphabetic typography strengthens this shift..."[15] The decline in S.A.T. scores is not to be seen as a shift from something good to something bad, as cause for alarm. The shift may signal a beneficial development. Ong sees the possiblity of a more profound understanding of language as an outcome of the shift. The elder who will fight a rear-guard action against the changes afoot may be wounded by

what Ong has to say:

> The modern age was thus much more a child of typography than it has commonly been made out to be. And, largely by reason of this fact, the modern age is now a thing of the past. Our own age today as has now been frequently pointed out, is marked by a new stress on the auditory. We live by telephone, radio, and television (which is never mere pictures, but is unequivocally a sound medium quite as much as it is a visual one), as well as by rapid transit, which expedites physical presence, and the use of voice to a degree unthinkable for typographic man. But this is not to say that we are returning to an earlier oral-aural world. There is no return to the past. The successive verbal media do not abolish one another. The present sensorium is dismayingly mixed and we are hard put to understand it, but for the first time in the history of mankind the possibility of some kind of understanding is opening up. This itself gives us a unique opportunity to become aware at a new depth of the significance of the word.[16]

It should become the mission of experts in testing to measure this new "sensorium..dismayingly mixed," and the mission of schooling to produce the functionally and contextually articulate communicator. The system should be designed to deliver persons who have learned to express themselves and to receive the expressions of others in various contexts making various demands on them.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Data with a national perspective have revealed some standard-setting states

with relatively higher levels of tradition, scope, availability and popularity of course offerings in speech communication. The Proceedings of the SCA conference on Long Range Goals and Priorities in Speech Communication identify Michigan as a trend-setting state, a fact substantiated in the interpretation in this essay: "Since trends such as that in Michigan foreshadow the emergence of interdisciplinary secondary programs, SCA's Associate Executive Secretary of Education should encourage secondary speech teachers to lead in the formation of administrative structures reflecting more global, interdisciplinary communication programs."[17] Teachers in all states need to read and act on the ideas expressed in the "Symposium: Diffusing Communication into the Secondary School Curriculum."[18] The status threatened by the new climate of retreat to the basics is in need of maintenance. Only teachers in professional association at the state, regional and national levels can write the curriculum guides, conduct in-service workshops, set teacher preparation standards, and renew their certification of quality through study of journals and interaction at conventions. The state and regional associations must be the keepers of the status. It is interesting that no states coming under the jurisdiction of the Southern Speech Communication Association rank above 31st place in the table of state rankings. A closer look at the status of speech courses even in the highest ranked states shows deficiencies which should permit no complacency anywhere. A report on New York State in 1973 concludes that "Speech instruction appeared to emphasize public performance and did not appear to be responsive to the trend apparent at the college level toward more instruction in interpersonal communication."[19] The report also finds small numbers of students exposed to speech communication, teachers academically unqualified, teachers spread thin over many different content areas, less capable students attracted to speech courses, poor state support for the area,

and generally inadequate speech education. Even in Michigan, a decrease in the number of speech assignments given teachers qualified in speech communication has been noted.[20] In sum, the great need is for state and regional associations to shore up a status that may be crumbling and then improve that standing of course offerings in each state by somehow getting the word to classroom teachers and, through them, to the policy makers in each school district. Otherwise, the next benchmark study may show a loss of ground, and that translates into a degree of loss of significant symbolic interaction at the intrapersonal, interpersonal, group and public levels.

FOOTNOTES

[1]Sharon A. Ratliffe, "Descriptions of Current Teacher Preparation Models and Possible New Models for Communication Education," in Proceedings: Speech Communication Association Summer Conference IX: Long Range Goals and Priorities in Speech Communication, eds. Robert C. Jeffrey and William Work. (New York: SCA, 1973), p. 103.

[2]James Gibson, "What Is the Relationship Between the Speech Curricula of High Schools and Colleges?," in Proceedings, p. 51.

[3]See for example, Sharon A. Ratliffe and Deldee M. Herman, "The Status: In High Schools of Michigan," Speech Teacher, 18 (January, 1969), pp. 45-49. There are additional reports on Washington and New York State in the symposium. See also, William D. Brooks, "The Status of Speech in Secondary Schools: A Summary of State Studies," Speech Teacher, 18 (November, 1969), pp. 276-281.

[4]Emanual J. Kerikas, "The Current Status of Speech Education in the Public Secondary Schools of the Intermountain States," (Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University, 1962).

[5]Jo Sprague, "Criteria for Evaluating Secondary Language Arts Curricula," in Proceedings, p. 74.

[6]Logan C. Osterndorf and Paul J. Horn, Course Offerings, Enrollments, And Curriculum Practices in Public Secondary Schools, 1972-73 (Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976).

[7]Logan C. Osterndorf and Paul J. Horn, Course Offerings, Enrollments, And Curriculum Practices in Public Secondary Schools, 1972-73 (Washinton, D.C.:

U.S. Government Printing Office, 1976), p. 11.

[8]Grace S. Wright, Subject Offerings and Enrollments in Public Secondary Schools (Washinton, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1965).

[9]Osterndorf and Horn, Course Offerings, p. 5.

[10]Osterndorf and Horn, Course Offerings, p. 4.

[11]Osterndorf and Horn, Course Offerings, p. 5.

[12]John F. Deethardt, "Concern for Status: How the States Rank in Secondary Speech Education," Unpublished paper, 1967.

[13]Osterndorf and Horn, Course Offerings, p. 22.

[14]"Why SAT Scores Decline," Newsweek, 90 (September 9, 1977), p. 83. See also, Science News, 112 (September 3, 1977), pp. 148-49.

[15]Walter J. Ong, The Presence of the Word (New Haven: Yale Univeristy Press, 1967), p. 8.

[16]Ong, p. 9.

[17]Proceedings, p. 17.

[18]Communication Education, 26 (September, 1977), 235-250.

[19]Susan D. Carrel and Charles R. Petrie, "The States of Speech Education in New York Public Senior High Schools, 1972-73," Today's Speech, 22 (Spring, 1974), p. 49.

[20]Anne W. Harrington, "The Need to Begin Diffusing Communication Concepts," Communication Education, 26 (September, 1977), p. 236.

State Ranking	Secondary Population		Number of Schools		Speech and Public Speaking I (Number of Schools)				(Enrollment)			
	1973	1961	1973	1961	1973		1961		1973		1961	
	#	#	#	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Category I												
1. Michigan	893,802	538,741	959	807	608	(63.3) 6t	430	(53.2) 8	56,419	(6.3) 9	27,664	(5.1) 14t
2. Washington	341,285	219,791	497	392	277	(55.7) 17	228	(55.6) 7	20,507	(6.0) 11t	9,361	(4.2) 17
3. Colorado	251,945	118,947	385	293	231	(60.0) 10	149	(50.8) 12	16,438	(6.5) 8t	8,118	(6.8) 8
4. California	1,942,257	942,900	1713	807	801	(46.7) 25	526	(65.1) 2	59,708	(3.0) 27t	38,567	(4.0) 18t
5. Missouri	425,314	246,741	721	581	441	(61.1) 9	281	(48.3) 15	24,682	(5.8) 12	12,704	(5.1) 14t
6. Ohio	1,049,941	509,659	1152	1000	707	(61.3) 8	594	(59.4) 4	39,886	(3.7) 22	24,148	(3.9) 19t
7. Minnesota	463,387	260,803	637	554	373	(58.5) 13	277	(50.0) 13	30,495	(6.9) 7	15,481	(5.9) 9t
8. Iowa	281,657	190,208	681	654	423	(62.1) 7	305	(46.6) 16	21,363	(7.5) 5	10,313	(5.8) 10t
9. New Jersey	567,124	298,851	450	304	198	(44.0) 29	133	(43.7) 19	10,118	(1.7) 34t	11,692	(3.9) 19t
10. Illinois	874,159	492,019	1000	893	593	(59.3) 11	370	(41.5) 22	53,740	(6.1) 10	23,958	(4.8) 15
11. Wisconsin	429,967	243,375	619	577	335	(54.1) 19t	174	(30.1) 27	30,560	(7.1) 6	9,927	(4.0) 18t
12. New York	1,378,806	342,482	1086	935	415	(38.2) 35	272	(29.0) 29	45,869	(3.3) 25t	21,310	(3.3) 21t
13. Pennsylvania	1,092,250	783,503	1025	946	424	(41.3) 31	234	(24.7) 34	38,178	(3.4) 24	23,795	(3.0) 23t

Theatre (Number of Schools)				Television, Radio, Film (Number of Schools)				Argumentation and Debate (Number of Schools)				Communication Theory, Speech, Diction (Number of Schools)		State Ranking
1973		1961		1973		1961		1973		1961		1973		1961
#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
410	(42.7)	128	(15.8)	94	(9.8)	9	(1.1)	228	(23.7)	20	(2.4)	62	(6.4)	1
	6		13		13		2t		7		4t		8	90/11 = 8.18
218	(43.8)	90	(22.9)	53	(10.6)	1	(.2)	133	(26.7)	13	(3.3)	12	(2.4)	12
	5		5		11		7t		4		2		18	104/11 = 9.45
129	(33.5)	43	(14.6)	30	(7.7)	1	(.3)	76	(19.7)	3	(1.0)	29	(7.5)	
	12t		18		19		6t		9		8		6	116/11 = 10.54
847	(49.4)	463	(57.3)	221	(12.9)	2	(.2)	248	(14.4)	11	(1.3)	60	(3.5)	2
	2		1		9		7t		14		6		14	125/11 = 11.36
202	(28.0)	144	(24.7)	25	(3.4)	3	(.5)	19	(10.9)	18	(3.0)	19	(2.6)	3
	18		4		28		4		19		3		17t	143/11 = 13
325	(28.2)	150	(15.0)	102	(8.8)	18	(1.8)	142	(12.3)	12	(1.2)	22	(1.9)	11
	17		16		14		1		17		7t		20t	145/11 = 13.18
178	(27.9)	29	(5.2)	52	(8.1)	1	(.1)	104	(16.3)	9	(1.6)	29	(4.5)	15
	19		36		17		8t		10		5t		10	147/11 = 13.36
141	(20.7)	48	(7.3)	29	(4.2)	1	(.1)	62	(9.1)	3	(.4)	50	(7.3)	17
	29t		31		24		8t		22		13t		7	172/11 = 15.63
169	(37.5	63	(20.7)	70	(15.5)	1	(.3)	22	(4.8)	1	(.3)	45	(10.0	16
	7		8t		2		6t		35		14		4	177/11 = 16.09
237	(23.7)	103	(11.5)	78	(7.8)	1	(.1)	112	(11.2)	6	(.6)	26	(2.6)	14
	27		22		18		8t		18t		11t		17t	179/11 = 16.27
154	(24.8)	33	(5.7)	54	(8.7)	1	(.1)	91	(14.7)	3	(.5)	21	(3.3)	18
	25		35		15		8t		13		12		15	195/11 = 17.54
318	(29.2)	176	(18.8)	165	(15.1)	11	(1.1)	63	(5.8)	6	(.6)	42	(3.8)	13
	16t		10		3		2t		31		11t		13t	196/11 = 17.81
211	(20.5)	67	(7.0)	67	(6.5)	1	(.1)	58	(5.6)	1	(.1)	15	(1.4)	19
	30		32		21t		8t		32		15		24	274/11 = 24.9

State Ranking	Secondary Population		Number of Schools		Speech and Public Speaking I (Number of Schools)				(Enrollment)			
	1973	1961	1973	1961	1973		1961		1973		1961	
		#	#	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Category II												
14. Oregon	196,092	130,352	334	285	237	(69.9) 2	188	(66.0) 1	12,772	(6.5) 8t	10,300	(7.9) 3
15. Arizona	172,030	75,075	181	105	83	(45.8) 26	48	(45.7) 18	6,676	(3.8) 21	2,693	(3.5) 20t
16. Idaho	87,329	56,420	180	182	126	(70.0) 1	94	(51.6) 11	4,802	(5.4) 14	4,744	(7.1) 7
17. Montana	74,736	47,660	210	150	119	(56.6) 15	49	(32.6) 25	6,791	(9.0) 3	2,769	(5.8) 10t
18. Indiana	869,920	426,549	515	857	298	(57.8) 14	378	(43.5) 20	23,037	(4.9) 18	23,849	(5.3) 13
19. Wyoming	38,267	23,045	110	83	8	(7.2) 47	43	(51.8) 10	337	(.88) 37	1,362	(5.9) 9t
20. South Dakota	70,025	41,963	219	219	100	(45.6) 27t	47	(21.4) 39	7,220	(10.3) 2	3,192	(7.6) 5
21. Massachusetts	503,705	318,502	516	459	171	(33.1) 39t	109	(23.7) 35	18,306	(3.6) 23t	13,917	(4.3) 16
22. Nebraska	145,232	84,952	398	496	258	(64.8) 3	57	(11.5) 47	11,209	(7.7) 4	2,556	(3.0) 23t
23. Maryland	372,174	211,066	286	221	77	(26.9) 44	41	(18.5) 41	814	(2.1) 32	2,641	(1.2) 32t
Category III												
24. Hawaii	74,282	48,695	50	53	28	(56.0) 16	30	(56.5) 5	2,062	(2.7) 30t	4,313	(8.8) 2
25. Alaska	26,872	5,973	46	33	27	(58.6) 12	16	(48.4) 14	3,443	(12.8) 1	211	(3.5) 20t

Theatre (Number of Schools)				Television, Radio, Film (Number of Schools)				Argumentation and Debate (Number of Schools)				Communication Theory, Speech, Diction (Number of Schools)		State Ranking
1973		1961		1973		1961		1973		1961		1973		1961
#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
163	(48,0)	56	(19,6)	28	(8,2)	0	(0)	88	(25.9)	2	(.1)	4	(1.1)	26
	4		9		16		0		6		10t		26	85/10 = 8.5
55	(29.2)	37	(35,2)	24	(13,2)	1	(.9)	18	(21,7)	0	(0)	8	(4.4)	10
	16t		?		7		3		8t		0		11	132/10 = 13.2
62	(34.4)	30	(16.4)	4	(2.2)	0	(0)	49	(27.2)	3	(1.6)	1	(.5)	27
	11		12		32		0		3		5t		31	139/10 = 13.9
54	(25.7)	34	(22.6)	7	(3.3)	0	(0)	30	(14.2)	1	(.6)	8	(3.8)	28
	23		6		29		0		15		11t		13t	150/10 = 15.0
110	(21.3)	81	(9.3)	34	(6.6)	1	(.1)	36	(6.9)	0	(0)	10	(1.9)	9
	28		28t		20		8t		27		0		20t	196/10 = 19.6
16	(14.5)	11	(13.2)	6	(5.4)	0	(0)	11	(10.0)	1	(1.2)	39	(35.4)	29
	36		20		22		0		21t		7t		1	210/10 = 21
32	(14.6)	21	(9.5)	4	(1.8)	0	(0)	57	(26.0)	1	(.4)	1	(.4)	32
	35		26		33t		0		5		13t		32	217/10 = 21.7
123	(23.8)	43	(9.3)	71	(13.7)	0	(0)	40	(7.7)	2	(.4)	9	(1.7)	30
	26		28t		6		0		25		13t		21t	232/10 = 23.2
48	(12.0)	41	(8.2)	7	(1.7)	0	(0)	55	(13.8)	4	(.8)	3	(.7)	33
	38		30		34t		0		16		9t		29t	233/10 = 23.3
100	(34.9)	37	(16.7)	12	(4.1)	1	(.4)	10	(3.4)	0	(0)	3	(1.0)	34
	10		11		25		5		37		0		27	264/10 = 26.4
18	(36.0)	11	(20.7)	5	(10.0)	0	(0)	8	(16.0)	0	(0)	6	(12.0)	35
	8		8t		12		0		11		0		2	94/9 = 10.44
15	(32.6)	5	(15.1)	3	(6.5)	0	(0)	10	(21.7)	0	(0)	2	(4.3)	39
	14		15		21t		0		8t		0		12	117/9 = 13

State Ranking	Secondary Population		Number of Schools		Speech and Public Speaking I (Number of Schools)				(Enrollment)			
	1973	1961	1973	1961	1973		1961		1973		1961	
	#	#	#	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Category III Con'd.												
26. Nevada	54,988	18,735	73	42	36	(49.3) *21*	25	(59.5) *3*	2,786	(5.0) *17*	1,077	(5.7) *11*
27. Rhode Island	72,592	43,789	64	53	20	(31.2) *41*	17	(32.0) *26*	1,990	(2.7) *30t*	5,391	(12.3) *1*
28. Delaware	48,425	30,000	47	49	15	(31.9) *40*	11	(22.4) *37*	1,611	(3.3) *25t*	725	(2.4) *26*
29. New Mexico	70,893	186,146	186	146	90	(48.3) *23*	64	(43.3) *21*	5,449	(4.3) *20t*	2,378	(3.3) *21t*
30. Connecticut	235,171	135,933	217	158	72	(33.1) *39t*	40	(25.3) *32*	3,232	(1.3) *36*	2,277	(1.6) *30t*
31. New Hamphsire	66,086	35,109	84	95	24	(28.5) *42*	20	(21.0) *40*	1,322	(2.0) *33t*	520	(1.4) *3*
32. Louisiana	279,899	199,498	334	567	215	(64.3) *4*	143	(25.2) *33*	17,000	(6.0) *11t*	6,204	(3.1) *22*
33. Virginia	442,095	246,923	423	399	161	(38.0) *36*	102	(25.5) *31*	8,884	(2.0) *33t*	4,453	(1.8) *28t*
34. North Carolina	442,605	324,047	519	883	141	(27.1) *43*	103	(11.6) *46*	7,034	(1.5) *35t*	3,173	(.9) *34*
35. Alabama	218,306	285.995	260	802	124	(47.6) *24*	88	(10.9) *48*	8,007	(3.6) *23t*	6,309	(2.2) *27*
36. Tennessee	383,542	234,265	525	485	184	(35.0) *38*	105	(21.6) *38*	10,220	(2.6) *31*	4,271	(1.8) *28t*
37. Georgia	402,214	265,980	462	656	172	(37.2) *37*	48	(7.3) *50*	11,311	(2.8) *29*	2,384	(.8) *35*

Theatre (Number of Schools)				Television, Radio, Film (Number of Schools)				Argumentation and Debate (Number of Schools)				Communication Theory, Speech, Diction (Number of Schools)		State Ranking
1973		1961		1973		1961		1973		1961		1973		1961
#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
20	(27.3) 21	9	(21.4) 7	2	(2.7) 31	0	(0) 0	11	(15.0) 12	0	(0) 0	2	(2.7) 16	21 139/9 = 15.44
21	(32.8) 13	5	(9.4) 27	9	(14.0) 5	0	(0) 0	5	(7.8) 24	0	(0) 0	1	(1.5) 23	38 190/9 = 21.11
12	(25.5) 24	6	(12.2) 21	7	(14.8) 4	0	(0) 0	5	(10.6) 20	0	(0) 0	1	(2.1) 19	24 216/9 = 24.
32	(17.2) 34	16	(10.9) 24	7	(3.7) 27	0	(0) 0	10	(5.3) 34	0	(0) 0	3	(1.6) 22t	36 226/9 = 25.11
76	(35.0) 9	14	(8.8) 29	35	(16.1) 1	0	(0) 0	4	(1.8) 41	0	(0) 0	3	(1.3) 25	41 242/9 = 26.88
15	(17.8) 33	2	(2.1) 45	11	(13.0) 8	0	(0) 0	5	(5.9) 30	0	(0) 0	4	(4.7) 9	48 243/9 = 27.
23	(6.8) 44	16	(2.8) 41	6	(1.7) 34t	0	(0) 0	30	(8.9) 23	0	(0) 0	1	(.2) 33t	23 245/9 = 27.22
130	(30.7) 15	63	(15.7) 14	12	(2.8) 30	0	(0) 0	12	(2.8) 40	0	(0) 0	7	(1.6) 22t	22 249/9 = 27.66
141	(27.1) 22	131	(14.8) 17	8	(1.5) 35t	0	(0) 0	16	(3.0) 39	0	(0) 0	9	(1.7) 21t	37 292/9 = 32.44
29	(11.1) 39	27	(3.3) 40	4	(1.5) 35t	0	(0) 0	17	(6.5) 29	0	(0) 0	2	(.7) 29t	42 294/9 = 32.66
67	(12.7) 37	25	(5.1) 37	2	(.3) 40	0	(0) 0	29	(5.5) 33	0	(0) 0	4	(.7) 29t	40 311/9 = 34.55
91	(19.6) 32	33	(5.0) 38	2	(.4) 39	0	(0) 0	35	(7.5) 26	0	(0) 0	4	(.8) 28	47 314/9 = 34.88

State Ranking	Secondary Population		Number of Schools		Speech and Public Speaking I (Number of Schools)				(Enrollment)			
	1973	1961	1973	1961	1973		1961		1973		1961	
		#	#	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Category IV												
38. Maine	89,884	60,105	159	178	36	(22.6) 45	28	(15.7) 43	1,567	(1.7) 34t	1,699	(2.8) 24
Category V												
39. Florida	619,481	338,098	452	462	219	(48.4) 22	158	(34.2) 24t	19,164	(3.0) 27t	10,731	(3.1) 22t
40. Oklahoma	267,235	214,702	693	793	375	(54.1) 19t	314	(39.6) 23	13,505	(5.05) 26	12,868	(5.9) 9t
Category VI												
41. Utah	137,007	85,079	170	138	108	(63.5) 5	77	(55.8) 6	7,154	(5.2) 15	6,349	(7.4) [illegible]
42. Kansas	219,807	156,705	535	621	339	(63.3) 6t	329	(53.0) 9	12,327	(5.6) 13	12,069	(7.7) 4
43. Vermont	38,317	20,291	57	81	30	(52.6) 20	8	(9.8) 49	1,238	(3.2) 26t	246	(1.2) 32t
Category VII												
44. West Virginia	442,095	246,923	423	399	124	(38.8) 33	89	(26.0) 30	5,471	(3.0) 27t	2,804	(1.7) 29
45. Mississippi	148,502	156,454	200	461	91	(45.5) 28	68	(14.7) 44	4,324	(2.9) 28	2,849	(1.8) 28t

Theatre (Number of Schools)				Television, Radio, Film (Number of Schools)				Argumentation and Debate (Number of Schools)				Communication Theory, Speech, Diction (Number of Schools)		State Ranking
1973		1961		1973		1961		1973		1961		1973		1961
#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
33	(20.7)	0	(0)	18	(11.3)	0	(0)	16	(10.0)	0	(0)	1	(.6)	51
	29t		0		10		0		21t		0		30	236/8 = 29.5
218	(48.2)	253	(11.4)	0	(0)	0	(0)	51	(11.2)	6	(1.2)	44	(10.1)	8
	3		23		0		0		18t		7t		3	149/9 = 16.55
50	(7.2)	51	(6.4)	0	(0)		(0)	47	(6.7)	7	(1.8)	65	(9.3)	6
	43		33		0		0		28		9t		5	185/9 = 20.55
57	(33.5)	41	(30.0)	8	(4.7)	0	(0)	51	(30.0)	1	(.7)	0	(0)	7
	12t		3		23		0		1		10t		0	81/9 = 9.
6	(1.1)	60	(9.6)	8	(1.4)	0	(0)	156	(29.1)	15	(2.4)	0	(0)	25
	48		25		36		0		2		4t		0	147/9 = 16.33
31	(54.3)	1	(1.2)	1	(1.7)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	1	(1.7)	50
	1		47		34t		0		0		0		21t	230/8 = 28.75
35	(10.9)	8	(2.3)	6	(1.8)	0	(0)	12	(3.7)	0	(0)	0	(0)	43
	40		44		33t		0		36		0		0	272/8 = 34.
5	(2.5)	16	(3.4)	1	(.5)	0	(0)	11	(5.5)	0	(0)	0	(0)	44
	47		39		38		0		33		0		0	285/8 = 35.62

Ranking	Secondary Population		Number of Schools		Speech and Public Speaking I (Number of Schools)				(Enrollment)			
	1973	1961	1973	1961	1973		1961		1973		1961	
		#	#	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Category VIII												
46. Texas	1,056,274	632,497	1540	1698	843	(54.7) 18	582	(34.2) 24t	50,187	(4.7) 19	34,885	(5.5) 12
47. Kentucky	276,644	180,993	370	468	169	(45,6) 27t	217	(45.3) 17	4,153	(1.5) 35t	4,875	(2.5) 25
48. North Dakota	55,985	45,458	267	325	112	(41.9) 30	97	(29.8) 28	2,433	(4.3) 20t	1,859	(4.0) 18t
49. D.C.	54,862	37,119	50	38	5	(10.0) 46	5	(13.1) 45	137	(.24) 38	225	(.6) 36
Category IX												
50. Arkansas	213,531	287,621	444	532	183	(41.2) 32	125	(23.5) 26	6,891	(3.2) 26t	3,023	(1.0) 33
51. South Carolina	252,155	189,515	312	401	121	(38.7) 34	67	(16.7) 42	3,944	(1.5) 35t	3,090	(1.6) 30t

Theatre (Number of Schools)				Television, Radio, Film (Number of Schools)				Argumentation and Debate (Number of Schools)				Communication Theory, Speech, Diction (Number of Schools)		State Ranking
1973		1961		1973		1961		1973		1961		1973		1961
#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	
312	(20.2)	99	(5.8)	21	(1.3)	2	(,1)	0	(0)	1	(.05)	0	(0)	5
	31		34		37		8t		0		16		0	199/9 = 22.11
162	(27.5)	63	(13.4)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	1	(,2)	20
	20		19		0		0		0		0		33t	176/7 = 25.14
23	(8.6)	9	(2.7)	0	(0)	0	(0)	9	(3,3)	14	(4,3)	0	(0)	31
	41		42t		0		0		38		1		0	218/7 = 27.25
3	(6.0)	1	(2,6)	2	(4,0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	49
	45		43		26		0		0		0		0	279/7 = 39.85
35	(7.8)	7	(1.3)	0	(0)	0	(0)	8	(1,8)	0	(0)	0	(0)	45
	42		46		0		0		41		0		0	246/7 = 35.14
9	(2.6)	11	(2,7)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	0	(0)	46
	46		42t		0		0		0		0		0	229/6 = 38.16